1	Electronic Supplementary Information				
2					
3	Engineering a photosensitizer nanoplatform for amplified photodynamic				
4	immunotherapy via tumor microenvironment modulation†				
5					
6	Yaxin Zhou, ^a Xiaomeng Ren, ^a Zhaosheng Hou, ^b Ningning Wang, ^a Yue Jiang, ^a and				
7	Yuxia Luan ^{a*}				
8					
9	^a Department of Pharmaceutics, Key Laboratory of Chemical Biology (Ministry of				
10	Education), School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Cheeloo College of Medicine,				
11	Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong, 250012, China. E-mail:				
12	yuxialuan@sdu.edu.cn				
13	^b College of Chemistry, Chemical Engineering and Materials Science, Shandong				
14	Normal University, Jinan, 250014, China.				
15					

Supplementary Figures



Fig. S1 Zeta potentials of CAM NPs.



Fig. S2 FI-IR of 1MT, AXT, Ce6, HSA and CAM NPs.



2 Fig. S3 The size of CAM NPs at different time point in different media.



3





5

Fig. S5 Fluorescence microscopy images of cell uptake of Ce6 and CAM NPs after
incubation for 6 h of B16F10 cells. Scale bar: 20 μm.

8 Table 1. Quantitative analysis of fluorescence microscopy images of intracellular
9 ROS production after different treatments. "(-)" and "(+)" represent the sample
10 without or with laser irradiation, respectively.

PBS (-)	Ce6 (-)	CAM (-)	PBS (+)	Ce6 (+)	CAM (+)
136.96	1470.98	1568.98	104.04	8156.97	8662.92



2

6

Fig. S6 Flow cytometry results of cellular ROS generation of Ce6, CAM NPs treated
B16F10 cells with or without irradiation. "(+)" and "(-)" represent the sample with



5 and without irradiation.

- 1 Fig. S7 Fluorescence microscopy images of cellular ROS generation of Ce6, CAM
 - PBS Ce6 (-) CAM (-)
- 2 NPs treated B16F10 cells without irradiation. Scale bar: 50 μm.

- 4 Fig. S8 Fluorescence microscopy images of the CRT exposure on B16F10 cells after
- 5 different treatments without irradiation. Scale bar: 20 μm.



3

- 7 Fig. S9 ATP secretion of B16F10 cells after different treatments. (1) PBS, (2) 1MT,
- 8 (3) AXT, (4) Ce6 and (5) CAM. "(+)" represents the sample with laser irradiation. (n
- 9 = 3, mean \pm SD, ***p < 0.001, *t*-test).





11 Fig. S10 Fluorescence microscopy images of HMGB1 release of B16F10 cells after

12 different treatments without irradiation. Scale bar: 20 µm.







Fig. S12 Hemolysis ratio of CAM NPs at different concentrations (n = 3).

Table S2. TFI of main organs and tumors in treated mice at 24 h after the intravenous

-	• •	
	1 10 1	antion
/		ecitori
1	111	CCLIOII

TFI	Heart	Liver	Spleen	Lung	Kidney	Tumor
Ce6	2.527E+07	4.871E+08	5.121E+07	1.162E+08	1.336E+08	9.358E+07
CAM	2.440E+07	1.309E+09	5.268E+07	1.176E+08	1.645E+08	1.407E+08





2 Fig. S13 Change in body weight of mice after different treatments in bilateral tumor



3 models (n = 5, mean \pm SD).

4

5 **Fig. S14** H&E staining assay of different organs after different treatments. Scale bar:

6 100 μm.



- 2 Fig. S15 IHC staining of CD31 in primary tumor after different treatments. Scale bar:
- 3 50 μm.



5 Fig. S16 Flow cytometry results of populations of a) Ths, b) CTLs, c) Tregs and d)

6 TAMs in primary tumor of different groups.



2 **Fig. S17** Relative populations of Ths, CTLs and Tregs in splenic lymphocytes (n = 3,

3 mean \pm SD, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001 and ****p < 0.0001, t-test).



4

5 **Fig. S18** Levels of serum cytokines of different treated mice.



6

7 Fig. S19 Change in average abscopal tumor volume (n = 5, mean \pm SD, ****p <

8 0.0001, *t*-test).



4



3 mean \pm SD, ****p < 0.0001, *t*-test).



5 Fig. S21 Flow cytometry results of populations of a) Ths, b) CTLs, c) Tregs and d)

6 TAMs in abscopal tumor of different groups.